REMARKS

The Applicant acknowledges that the amendments made in the previous response to office action, have been entered. Claims 1-24 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 11-13, 15-17, 19-21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,890,189 *(Nozue)*.

For ease of discussion, claim 7 is discussed first. Claim 7, in part, calls for writing to at least one register to define a privileged memory region. Claim 7 further specifies defining at least one computer instruction as a privileged instruction, wherein the privileged instruction is resident in the privileged memory region. Thus, reading the second claim feature in light of the first feature, claim 7 calls for storing the privileged instruction in the memory region, where that memory region is defined by the at least one register (see the first feature of claim 1).

The Examiner argues that the "at least one register" of claim 7 that defines the privileged memory region is shown as element 17 of Figure 3 of Nozue. Element 17 of Figure 3 is referred to as a "current memory protection information" in Nozue, and is used to store a memory protection information for the currently executed instruction. Nozue, col. 7, lines 44-47. In particular, Nozue describes that element 17 includes a current transition permission 4, a current execution permission 5, and a current right permission 6 for the current executed instruction. *Id.* Thus, Nozue describes that the current memory protection information 17 stores various permissions (e.g., transition permission, execution permission, right permission) of the currently executed instruction. Accordingly, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, element 17 does not

define a memory region <u>in which the privileged instruction is resident</u>. For at least this reason, claim 7 and its dependent claims are allowable.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner's entire rejection is based on generalities and thus, unfortunately, lacks specificity. The Examiner appears to take this nebulous approach to hide the deficiencies in Nozue, which fails to teach several of the claimed features. As a starting point, even though the term "selected information" is recited in virtually every element of claim 1, the Examiner is unable to specify what exactly in Nozue corresponds to the claimed "selected information." The focus on the term "selected information" is helpful because it aids in illustrating the interplay between the various elements of claim 1 and also because it highlights the numerous deficiencies in the Examiner's argument, as discussed below.

The first element of claim 1 calls for controlling access to selected information using attributes defined in a first table. Claim 1 further calls for controlling access to the selected information using a second table that associates at least one of a read and write privilege with one or more physical addresses of a memory that houses the selected information. Thus, reading the first two elements together, claim 1 calls for controlling access to the <u>selected information</u> using the first table and controlling access to <u>that selected information</u> using the second table.

The Examiner first argues that Nozue teaches the first claimed feature in Figure 45. Figure 45 illustrates a program management table that indicates current utilization state of the logical address space, and contains fields for a region number identifying the region, a start address of the region, the end address of the region, and program name allocated to the region.

Nozue, col. 42, lines 6-15. The Examiner does not even attempt to identify the "selected information" in this table. Instead, the Examiner simply states that "[F]igure 45 shows the first table." See Office Action, page 4.

In an attempt to show the second claimed feature, the Examiner points to Figure 24A of Nozue. Figure 24A illustrates a configuration of a translation look-aside buffer (TLB) check device that is used to check a TLB that stores logical and physical page number pairs. *See* Nozue, columns 23-24. Figure 24A includes a TLB 31, where each entry of this TLB includes a logical page number 311, physical page number 311, a plurality of thread numbers 318, and memory access permission (rwx) 323 associated with each of the thread numbers 318. Nazue, col. 24: line 59, col. 25, line 8. Here, the Examiner once again fails to specify what in Figure 24 corresponds to the "selected information" referenced in claim 1, where that "selected information" is also tied to the first feature of claim 1.

As noted, the first two features of claim 1, when read together, call for controlling access to the selected information using the first table and controlling access to that selected information using the second table. Nozue does not teach these claimed features, and the Examiner clearly fails to show these features. Moreover, the second claim feature further that the access to the selected information is controlled using a second table that associates at least one of a read and write privilege with one or more physical addresses of a memory that houses the selected information. In contrast, Nozue teaches that "rwz" permissions are **"associated with each of the thread numbers 318."** Nozue, col. 25, lines 5-8. The Examiner conveniently ignores this express teaching of Nozue that the "rwz" permissions are associated with the thread numbers,

and not the physical memory addresses. Moreover, because the permissions in Nozue are <u>not</u> associated with the physical addresses of a memory (as called for by claim 1), these permissions are also not associated with the memory that "houses the selected information" (again, as specified in claim 1). Accordingly, for the aforementioned reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable.

In addition to the above-noted deficiencies, the Office Action contains other shortcomings as well. For example, in discussing the last two features of claim 1, the Examiner once again fails to identify what in Nozue corresponds to the "selected information" of claim 1, and specifically which <u>program</u> submits request to access that selected information and further where that <u>program</u> is the allowed access to that selected information. Again, the Examiner is reminded that the "selected information" is that information which is also referenced in the first two elements of claim 1.

For reasons presented above, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable. Additionally, independent claims 15, 19, and 24, and their respective dependent claims, are allowable in view of the respective claimed features recited therein.

U.S. Patent 4,442,484 *(Childs)*, the other referenced relied upon by the Examiner, also fails to teach or suggest the features missing from the first reference. Accordingly, for this reason, all of the pending claims are believed to be allowable. In view of the reasons presented above, reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested and a Notice of Allowances is respectfully solicited.

Serial No. 09/825,905

If for any reason, the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Houston, Texas telephone number (713) 934-4064 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON
CUSTOMER NO. 23720

Date: ___12/5/05___

Ruben S. Bains, Reg. No. 46,532
10333 Richmond, Suite 1100
Houston, Texas 77042
(713) 934-4064
(713) 934-7011 (facsimile)

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS